THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. III. MARCH, 1923. No. 3.

England's Divine Destiny.[1]

Synopsis.

The article begins by describing the conditions in England prior to the reign of Queen Elizabeth. No industry; hardly any fleet; the trade in the hands of foreigners. "A home-staying, agricultural, and pastoral people."

Then the rise of English sea-power after the decline of Spain (1588). The founding of colonies in America. The rivalry with France, which did not end till 1815. Treaty of Utrecht. Subsequent policy of England. Commercial rivalry of Spain and France. The Mediterranean. Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle. Pitt. American Revolution. Colonization of South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Egypt. Policy after 1870 to the present day.

Follows the translation: —

The policy of giving up, preached and practised by the liberal economists, the dissenting conservatives, and the philosophic radicals, has never been accepted by the Tories. The latter wrote in the *Times*, in reply to the articles by Smith: "They wish to state, once for all, that England has no intention whatever of giving up its possessions overseas."

In 1874 the conservative party takes the reins. It is the triumph of the imperialistic policy. It is the awakening of the

1) The subjoined article has been contributed by Rev. H. Ruhland, of Ottawa, Can. It has been taken from an article by Jean Desy, Professor of Higher Commerce, in the *Revue Trimestrielle Canadienne*. The article is inscribed "De L'Ile à L'Empire" (From Island to Empire). Rev. Ruhland gives a synopsis of the article, then translates the most remarkable portion, and, omitting a lengthy dissertation on the strengthening of the ties that bind the British Colonies to the mother country, reproduces in condensed form the Professor's concluding remarks. D.

national combativeness which Palmerston had utilized for the glory of his party and in the interest of his popularity. (44)

In 1876 Victoria accepts the imperial crown of India, and in 1879 Lord Beaconsfield gives the English people the Roman motto: *"Imperium et Libertas."*

Let us inquire into the economic and scientific causes which may be at the root of this bellicose and conquering *renaissance*. We shall start with the scientific causes.

The theologians, the historians, and the politicians have placed a nimbus of self-abnegation around the aggressive tendencies of their nation. They have made the word "patriotism" synonymous with "duty," and have implanted in the souls of the British people the idea of a privileged rôle which God is said to have given them. With the aid of sophisms they have ascribed to contemporaneous events a character of morality, and have affirmed that God, who reveals history, has imposed on the British nation this need of annexation and has made its conquests justifiable. (45)

They have demonstrated that the British power is founded on the rock of the Scriptures. (46)

Lord Salisbury affirmed, without a smile, that Providence has given Britain the mission to "influence the morality and the progress of the world to an extent such as an empire has never done before"; and Gladstone, too, speaks of the providential mission of the English.

Cecil Rhodes assures us in his will that in giving to his people the greatest amount of power and free scope possible he is only conforming his policy to the designs of Heaven.

Associations are formed and books appear to prove that the British nation is affiliated to the tribe of Ephraim, and that it is carrying out, in the present age, the mission which was given to the Jews by Jehovah. (47)

The title of the works by Archdeacon Evans and the Rev. Robert Douglas state this clearly: "England under God," "God and Greater Britain." The theologians spare no pains in proving from the Bible that the British are the chosen people. Some of the proofs adduced are uncommonly amusing; for instance, we are assured that the word British is a literal translation of the Hebrew expression "the person (*ish*) of the divine covenant (*b'rit*)." (48)

---

(44) Bardoux, pp. 303. 304.

(45) Seeley, *British Expansion*, p. 162.

(46) R. Douglas, *God and Greater Britain*, p. 139.

(47) Bardoux, p. 80.

(48) R. Douglas, *l. c.*, p. 40.

We are also told that the coronation ceremonies are identical with those prescribed for the coronation of Solomon, as well as that the royal standard still preserves the arms of David, the lion rampant. (49)

Thus sacred history teaches the English that God ordered the destruction of its opponents in order to assure the progressive development of the chosen people. (50)

However, it would not be easy to bring such arguments home to the great mass of the people, and for this reason a less scientific propaganda has been organized for their benefit. Religious societies have spread amongst the lower classes a short prayer which is easily remembered: "We thank Thee, O Lord, who hast placed us above other nations."

When the Boer War broke out, every soldier was presented with a Bible, the cover of which was decorated with English flags and badges; and when Pretoria was taken, Lord Roberts ordered that thanks be given to "the God of the imperial race." (51)

Austin, poet laureate, sang, inspired by these sentiments: —

Whoever fights for England fights for God.
Who dies for England sleeps with God. (52)

It is for the greater glory of God and Great Britain that the massacres in Borneo were perpetrated, the bloody acts against the sepoys were committed, and the unjustifiable aggression against the Boers started, and so forth. . . .

Tennyson gives expression to the "ancient dreams of the zenith of imperial power," and Kingsley writes the first poem on imperialism, while Kipling appears as official bard. He creates the empire "composed of heterogeneous elements in the brains of his readers," . . . and the whole race reads it.

Carlyle, Ruskin, and J. A. Froude were the heralds of political imperialism. According to Carlyle, the empire must be preserved and extended by force of arms. (53)

Ruskin, in a conference on the future of England, (54) suggested the idea of collecting the most adventurous and the most

---

(49) R. Douglas, *l. c.*, p. 143.

(50) K. Pearson, cited by Bardoux, *Contemporaneous England*, p. 475.

(51) J. C. Godard, *Patriotism and Ethics*, p. 130.

(52) In connection with this matter, see the work of Bardoux, above cited, in which these various religious and political currents are analyzed, and from which most of the following citations are taken. See also the books of Messrs. Caxamian and E. Guyot.

(53) *Past and Present*, pp. 135. 137. 140. 141. (54) *Crown*, § 159.

ambitious young men and having them found new seats of authority, new centers of thought, as well as of production. Froude advises to open the public services, and the honors thus far reserved to the English, to the Colonials. (55)

He lets us see the Oceanic Empire, as dreamed of by Harrington in the beginning of the seventeenth century.

The philosophers, availing themselves of the theory of evolution, applied by Darwin to natural science, have tried to prove that England is unconsciously marching towards the fulfilment of its imperial destiny, and that "its past connects it with its future." Giddings, Seeley, and Bridge have tried to demonstrate philosophically and historically that the nations are influenced by impulses and sentiments springing up from past generations. They teach us that unlimited expansion is the motive principle of English history, which gives a hidden and instinctive force to the national life, and that the heritage of the "past ages, with all the prerogatives and solemn obligations which spring from this noble privilege," imposes upon the English the duty of being imperialists. (56)

To this thesis is added the one of the undeniable superiority of the "race which rules." This sentiment of superiority morally justifies all colonials and officials who are working for expansion. (57)

The interests of the superior race outweigh all the principles of international law. The English race must struggle in order to maintain its superiority. That is inevitable if it desires to survive. (58)

The inferior races will go under as they have not "found the narrow path which leads to a greater development."

Let us now inquire into the economic factors. About 1878 British industry and trade underwent a crisis. The Boards of Trade of Birmingham and Sheffield demanded the colonial markets, and talked about an Imperial Free Trade Federation. The members of the Committee of Inquiry into the commercial crisis stated that production was greater than the demand and ascribed this condition of affairs to an excess of capital.

The British manufacturers, between 1885 and 1900, desired to find in the so-called exploitation colonies the customers for all their metal products. The already settled colonies offered but a limited

(55) *Oceana*, pp. 138. 194.

(56) J. Lawson-Walton, *Imperial Liberal League*, Leaflet No. 17, 1900 to 1901, p. 5.

(57) Spencer Wilkinson, *The Great Alternative*, 2d ed., 1902, p. 222.

(58) Pearson, *National Life*, 1900, p. 18.

market, notwithstanding the enormous increase in their population. Hence the economic needs, they said, would force the statesmen to make annexations. Thus we find that in sixteen years (1884 to 1900) the British Empire was increased by 4 million square miles, whilst its population gained 57 millions. (59)

Conclusion.

Dilke, Egerton, and de la Billiere longed for a great war which would consolidate imperial defense, the protector of the home export trade. Their wish has been fulfilled.

Two figures in a novel by De Vogue stand for the lust of gain and the hypocrisy of the grasping shopkeepers. Robinson, "Master of the Sea," by "moving his hand over the globe," discloses his system: "Meddle everywhere, risk everywhere"; command everywhere the attack of the banknotes, those "chiefs of the modern armies, who start wars which end to their advantage." Big profits, that is the motive and the aim of all great undertakings.

Hiram Jarvis, missionary, enlightened by the new faith, preaches patriotism and the union of the whole Anglo-Saxon race. In a sermon, embellished with citations from the Bible, he holds up the ocean as the "source of great power" to the descendants of the sailors of the reign of Queen Elizabeth.

The English race demands this "sea-power" back, in order to realize a lofty ideal of civilization, justice, and equity.

We might have more faith in these sublime and immaterial things if the lessons of history had not made us suspicious, and if Montesquieu had not said: "Other nations have subordinated trade interests to political interests; this nation has always subordinated its political to trade interests. It is the nation which has best understood how to make use of these three things: religion, trade, and liberty."

A Bit of Recent Swedish Church History.

Prof. W. H. T. Dau, St. Louis, Mo.

38. The Conference in 1910.

When *Fosterlands-Stiftelsen* met for its annual conference in 1910 in Bethlehem Church, it was so unlike the preceding conference that from the very start it was divided into two groups which stood determinedly opposed to one another. These groups

(59) Bardoux, pp. 458. 459.

were the society of *E. F. S.'s Bibeltrogna Vaenner,* which numbered about 70 members among the voting delegates of the conference, and the determined followers of the fundamental position of Kolmodin, who were most likely somewhat more numerous. But between these two bands there stood a great undecided group, which was ready to follow the directors. Now that the directors turned against the *Bibeltrogna Vaenner,* they had on their side not only this central group, but, as a matter of course, also the decided Kolmodinians.

These latter had at some sort of a gathering in the upper story of *Stiftelsen's* publishing house entered into a formal compact, on the purpose of which it has not been possible to obtain reliable information. Only this much is known, that amongst other things they signed an address declaring their devotion to Professor Kolmodin, in which they expressed their gratitude for the past and their hope for the future. During the annual meeting this address was signed by most of *Stiftelsen's* preachers who were attending the conference. However, it is hardly likely that the aforementioned compact was limited to this one measure, for at the conference the Kolmodinians displayed an astonishing unanimity. As their leaders there now came forward Pastor K. Gustafsson and Circuit Judge A. E. Collin.

One of the reasons why the central group followed the directors to as great an extent as they actually did may have been this, that two of the better-known and more active minority men of last year had now adopted the position of the directors. These were Pastor D. A. Aernstroem and traveling representative J. Nordin. Of these two the former especially was so violent and cutting in his remarks about the B. V. that he was hissed and made to sit down by the conference.

However, another and a more likely reason may have been furnished by the fact that the B. V., who submitted a slate of their own for the election of directors, went to work with some stubbornness: they nominated only two of the outgoing members of the directorate for reelection. Of course, more than one observed that their object was to aim at everything in order to achieve a good deal. But when the time came for the B. V. to reduce their demands somewhat, the other side had to admit that the action of the B. V. was correct in principle, for it could hardly be denied that the B. V. had nominated for election into the directorate men who favored the Kolmodinian Bible criticism. And even though extremely few of the outgoing directors had been nominated, the

result plainly turned out the same in the end; for not even Pastor N. Hyllander, who was nominated both in the directors' list and in that of the B. V., failed to be elected. It was apparent that the majority was unwilling to increase the number of *Bibeltrogna* in the directorate.

The first collision thus took place at the election of directors, but the main battle was not fought until the next session on Saturday, June 11. Almost a year had now passed since *Stiftelsen* had abandoned the first of the fundamental principles of the Reformation. Notwithstanding this, the question was up for discussion at the conference: "How can *Stiftelsen* best take part in the fight against antichristian movements of the present time?" During the discussion it was maintained by members of the B. V. that in the fight between Christ and antichrist no quarter should be asked or given, for every concession to the antichristian movements would prove fatal, inasmuch as it would, amongst other things, paralyze the combatants and cause them to discontinue the fight against unbelief, as one of whose forms also Bible criticism must be regarded. Now, *Stiftelsen,* the speakers argued, had made concessions and by the measures which it had adopted against *Facklan* and *Nya Vaektaren* had taken up the fight against the defenders of the faith. Under these conditions *Stiftelsen* could not conduct a successful warfare against unbelief, unless it would honestly confess its error, rescind its vote of confidence in the Kolmodinian Bible criticism, and go back to the first basic principle of the Reformation.

Here, now, the finger had been put on a very sensitive spot, and the respective members of the conference felt the smart keenly. There was no inclination to rescind the vote of confidence, but for practical reasons it was plainly desired that the matter for the present be consigned to oblivion. Circuit Judge A. E. Collin, who now obtained the floor, sidestepped the subject under discussion completely and raised the question what was to be done with the B. V. who dared to call themselves *Bibeltrogna Vaenner* of the *Evangeliska Fosterlands-Stiftelsen.* He offered a motion that the convention declare its protest against the name. Plainly he desired to see the society regarded as an independent body outside of *Stiftelsen.* The B. V. contended that they were members of E. F. S., and consequently had the right to call themselves its *Vaenner.* But the majority paid no attention to this argument. After a heated debate the conference adopted the motion of Collin, which contained a passage saying that *Stiftelsen* was a body of believers in

the Bible; it was only the last part of Collin's resolution that was directed against the name of the B. V. and their continuing to be members of *Stiftelsen.* Against this part of the resolution the leading men of the B. V. stated their reservation.

The session was about to adjourn when a delegate rose to put the question whether the convention was willing to defend the authority of the entire Bible and work for retaining it in use. It was certainly surprising that this question was answered by a practically unanimous "yes." To the B. V. this was, indeed, pleasing, for that was just the position to which they wished to guide *Stiftelsen.* But it was necessary now to establish the fact whether the answer to the delegate was really meant as an honest confession. Pastor Vitalis Svensson, who had evidently caught the extraordinary significance of the moment, immediately asked for the floor and declared that by the answer to the delegate the conference's vote of confidence in Professor Kolmodin's position had been rescinded. He had scarcely had time to make his statement when the church resounded with the most frenetic cries of, "No!" Perhaps a scene like this has never occurred in a house of worship. E. F. S., then, had dared to rescind the vote of confidence which at one time they had given in favor of Bible criticism.

39. Activity of the B. V.

For those who clung to *Stiftelsen's* old position and to the first fundamental principle of the Reformation the conference in 1909 had been an unhappy affair, and the conference of 1910 was little better. One gain of importance for the future, however, had accrued from the pending strife in *Stiftelsen:* these friends were now organized in *E. F. S.'s Bibeltrogna Vaenner.* This organization should have been effected already in 1909, but at that time the need of it was not yet perceived. It was a great good fortune for this entire *Richtung* that the organization was fully completed before the conference of 1910 was adjourned. If it had not been, nobody can say how the friends of the Bible could have been kept together. On June 10 statutes were adopted and a directorate elected. The latter was composed of the following persons: wholesale merchant Lambert Jepsson, president; Pastor J. Vicander, vice-president; Director G. L. Lagergrehn, treasurer; Editor Axel B. Svensson, secretary; public school teacher O. Halvarsson, traveling representative A. Lindstroem, merchant Aug. Paulsson, Pastor Vitalis Svensson, and Pastor Alb. Oestgren.

The principal aim of the society was to combat the Bible

criticism and other rationalistic tendencies of modern theology. That the directors aimed to carry this program into effect as well as they could may be gleaned from the measures which they took immediately after the close of the conference. For instance, three representatives of B. V. were found in attendance at the meeting of neotheologians which was held at Oerebro about the end of the month of June, and according to the unanimous report of the secular press they maintained from the start the old Lutheran Bible-faith.

However, a measure of B. V. which in its consequences was most important was a circular letter which during the summer of 1910 was sent to all congregations, representatives, and preachers of *Stiftelsen.* By itself the circular was nothing remarkable, but, as stated, it became the more significant by the effects it produced. In this circular, which was chiefly a vindication of the society's name, there occurred one passage in which the statement was made that within *Stiftelsen* "both the ideas of Bible criticism and views of the redemption by Christ and justification before God that differed from the Lutheran Confession were rampant." The circular was signed by all the directors of B. V.

40. The Enok Hedberg Incident.

Plainly this circular demanded an answer from *Stiftelsen.* It would not do to let such charges go unanswered. But, on the other hand, it was not easy to answer the charge, for it could not be denied that Bible criticism "was rampant" in E. F. S., since amongst other things it had been given a vote of confidence. Likewise it was a fact that many of *Stiftelsen's* representatives and several of its preachers taught a doctrine of reconciliation and justification in which there was little of Lutheran teaching. Now a committee was appointed from the directors of *Stiftelsen* with instructions to answer the circular of the B. V., and for this committee one member of the directorate was chosen who was thought to stand close to the B. V. in his faith and religious views.

However, as stated, the task was quite difficult. It proved a life's task for the committee to find reasons for utterly refuting the charges of B. V. But this could hardly be done, since B. V. could immediately point to some of the servants of *Stiftelsen* who had publicly professed their allegiance to Bible criticism. Such persons were found both among the directors and the representatives, missionaries, and preachers. For the last two classes the directors alone were responsible.

Among these a mission-pastor by the name of Enok Hedberg had become prominent as a Kolmodinian more than others at the conference in 1909. On several occasions he had also been pointed out in *Nya Vaektaren* as an instance of Bible criticism being tolerated within the ranks of *Stiftelsen.* Now, if the directors could induce *this man* to declare that he believed the whole Bible to be God's Word, they would have proved that the existence of B. V. was entirely superfluous, and their organ would have been marked as unreliable. But what if Hedberg failed to make the desired statement? Ah, the opinions among the directors, as was made plain afterwards, were divided as to what was to be done in that event: three members, who absolutely disapproved of Bible criticism, declared that Hedberg must be removed from office, but the majority was in favor of smoothing the affair over.

At a poorly attended meeting of the directors it was resolved to summon Hedberg for a hearing before the directorate. But here a question forced itself powerfully on the attention of the directors: How could *any one* of the directors induce Hedberg, of whose thorough agreement with the position of Kolmodin there could not be the least doubt, to answer with "yes" the question put to him by the directors?

The story of how this question was answered furnishes perhaps the most melancholy chapter in the Kolmodinian controversy, and we are sure that even our readers will wish that it had never happened. According to paragraphs 6 and 7 of the protocol of *Stiftelsen's* directorate for September 14 and 15 both the secretary of *Stiftelsen,* Pastor J. Montelius, and one of the directors, Director K. J. Ahlberg, were fully convinced that there are errors in the Bible. Notwithstanding this, Pastor Montelius expressed his regret that these supposed "errors" should prevent Hedberg from answering "yes" to the question whether the whole Bible is God's Word. The pastor, then, imagined and hoped that Hedberg, spite of his belief that there are errors in the Bible, — and that, if such are found in the Bible, they cannot be of God, — should, contrary to his innermost conviction, say: Yes, I believe that the whole Bible is God's infallible Word and has unlimited authority. We shall, of course, not pass judgment on Pastor Montelius, — he stands or falls to his Master, — still it is surprising, when glancing through *Budbaeraren* for the last year, to find him representing himself and the directors of E. F. S. in well-chosen words as believers in the Bible, spite of the fact that it is known that in a protocol of E. F. S. he has given expression to his conviction that there are

errors in the Bible, and that in his Bible class in the Sunday-school of Bethlehem Church he teaches distinctly that the Prophet Isaiah did not write the entire book that bears his name and that is ascribed to him by Christ and the apostles. However, as stated, we shall not pass judgment on him, as that is not our business, but we must brand his idea that there are errors in the Bible as an erroneous notion.[10])

The hearing of Hedberg took place September 13 and did not yield the result wished for, for Pastor Hedberg answered the question addressed to him with "no.", In his letter to the directors he states, in the first place, that the view of the Bible which he had expressed in his answer had been inculcated upon him at *Stiftelsen's* Mission Institute; in the second place, that it seemed strange to him that he should be subjected to trial for holding a view which the conference had approved and which was shared by many members of the directorate, in the third place, he stated that Pastor Montelius had some time ago admonished him to be careful not to work for the so-called Kolmodinian *Richtung;* "for," said he, "Svensson's party is very angry at me." This remark, that Hedberg must avoid working for the Kolmodinian notions since people were angry at him, naturally leads to the question: What would happen, if men were not angry?

41. The Division in the Directorate of E. F. S.

It can easily be understood that the turn which the Hedberg affair had taken was a grievous blow to the directorate as a whole, no matter what and how different the motives may have been that prompted the majority of the directors to decide on examining him. If the aim had been to deal the B. V. a mortal blow, that blow now fell on *Stiftelsen* itself. It was a boomerang that recoiled on the party that had flung the weapon. There now followed long deliberations; appearances, at least, must be saved. It seemed, too, as if this effort would succeed; for Pastor Hedberg was induced to declare that he agreed with the resolution passed at the Upsala meeting — provided this were not taken to mean that he had

10) If in a copy of the Bible that should fall into the hands of Pastor Montelius one leaf were missing, the *Bible* would not on that account be defective. If in the translation which we have something should have been rendered incorrectly, the *Bible* would not on that account be faulty. If the manuscripts that have been preserved till our time should in some places be undecipherable, or some mistake of a copyist should be found in it, the *Bible* would not on that account be erroneous.

changed his standpoint. With this statement the majority of the members of the directorate declared themselves satisfied as far as the confessional issue was concerned, but it was furthermore demanded that Hedberg should ask the directors' pardon for having shown himself grouchy at his hearing. This he refused to do, for he rather considered himself the offended party, and when the directors pressed their demand and passed a resolution that he be "admonished," he submitted his request to be dismissed from the service of E. F. S. It is certainly remarkable that Hedberg was not urged to ask pardon for having spoken disrespectfully of the Bible, but only for not having been submissive enough to the directors.

While these things were happening, the contemplated answer to the circular of the B. V. had been completely forgotten, but after many difficulties the committee agreed on a draft for an answer thanks to mutual concessions which the members had made to each other. This answer contained an unconditional acknowledgment that the directors had erred when they published the book of Kolmodin. However, now it became apparent again that the majority of the directors shared the belief of Kolmodin, for the acknowledgment was eliminated and supplanted by a general phrase. Besides, the entire answer was so changed that Pastor Wadstroem absolutely refused to sign it. Thus it was shown again that it would be impossible in the future to combat the Kolmodinian Bible criticism by remaining in the directorate of *Stiftelsen.*

The effects of the hearing of Hedberg were far-reaching. Without formally resigning from the directorate three of its members, Superintendent J. G. Hellenius, Pastor W. Gustafsson, and General G. F. O. Uggla withdrew from the directorate and organized a sort of a strike. The Director of Missions, Pastor J. Lindgren, soon followed them. The reason for their action was chiefly this, that these men disapproved the resolution of the directors to try Pastor Hedberg and the reasons which the directors had given for instituting the trial. Nevertheless they shared Hedberg's views. For example, in the still unrefuted account of his trial which Pastor Hedberg published it is asserted that Pastor Lindgren at a meeting in Joenkoeping said to Hedberg, referring to the impending trial: "I know your standpoint, and I share it." Besides, Pastor Lindgren had never kept his admiration for Professor Kolmodin concealed and in the main approved the latter's attitude towards the Bible. Regarding the other two members of the direc-

torate who were ministers, Pastor B. Wadstroem said in a communication to *Svenska Morganbladet (Swedish Morning Paper)* on November 14, 1910, that "these two had always zealously defended the theories of Professor Kolmodin regarding Bible criticism."

42. More Trouble for the Directors.

The withdrawal of the three directors aforementioned took place on November 8. On the same occasion Pastor Hedberg's request to be dismissed was laid before the meeting. But this was not yet the end of the directors' troubles: requests to be dismissed had been sent to this meeting by four workmen in the service of Inner Mission. Among these were traveling representatives Alfred Andersson and A. Linstroem, who held that they could no longer serve *Stiftelsen* after it had surrendered the first of the fundamental principles of the Reformation.

It was plain that the situation was becoming difficult, and the directors of *Stiftelsen* were greatly worried. The only one who saw a ray of light in what had happened was Pastor Wadstroem. He clearly hoped that E. F. S. was rid for all time to come of the Kolmodinian Director of Missions and the three members of the directorate who had withdrawn. Being a pronounced optimist, the mild old man saw affairs in a better light than they were, and expressed himself to that effect. Without reflecting that he was harming his own and the B. V.'s cause, he gave people to understand time and again in newspaper articles that conditions in E. F. S. had never been as good as they were now since the organization of *Stiftelsen*. This was altogether incorrect. Accordingly, the treasurer of B. V., Director G. L. Lagergrehn, entered the discussion and in a newspaper article gave a brief statement of the true state of affairs. He showed that E. F. S. had in no wise rescinded its vote of confidence in Bible criticism and had not taken any step to meet the minority. The only thing that had happened after Pastor Wadstroem had left the directorate with the words: "It is over with *Fosterlands-Stiftelsen,*" was that he himself had reentered the directorate.

It was certainly a weak point in the policy of the champions of the Bible that each of them followed his own line of attack, but the article of Lagergrehn may have been necessary, nevertheless, for nothing is more fatal in a controversy than to start a jubilation prematurely and to send out victory bulletins before the enemy has been defeated. *(To be continued.)*

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

Our recent synodical anniversary is noted in terms of admiration by *Deutscher Brief,* a Hamburg semimonthly publication (December 15, 1922). The historical facts relating to the origin of the Missouri Synod are briefly stated, and on the basis of our latest statistics the present size and activities of our Synod are described. "Regarding their doctrine," the writer says, "on which they insist rigorously, we may note only these facts, that they view the universal priesthood of a truly believing congregation as vested with the office [of the ministry], and that they deny every cooperation of man in his conversion (doctrine of election). They adhere firmly to the doctrine of inspiration." Brevity, otherwise the soul of wit, is here seen as the mother of inaccuracies. The Missourians believe that the universal priesthood of believers and the office of the ministry are two distinct matters. The right and duty to prepare, call, maintain, and, if need be, dismiss ministers belongs indeed to the Christian congregation, in which the Lord has vested the power of the keys. (See Walther's *Rechte Gestalt,* etc.) What connection the writer intended by his parenthetical remark about the doctrine of election with the monergism of the Missouri Synod's doctrine of conversion is not plain. The encomium which he bestows on us when he describes us as *"Hueter des Deutschtums"* (protectors of Germanism), we fear, never was applicable to our Synod in the sense in which this phrase is commonly used. It is certainly not applicable to-day, when nearly half the Missouri Synod is English. By the way, the name of our Synod is not *"Missionssynode,"* but *Missourisynode,* named after the State of Missouri. D.

The Supreme Court of Michigan has handed down a decision adverse to the petition for a referendum on the question whether all persons of school age shall be compelled to enter the public schools of the State. This means that the agitation against private schools in Michigan will rest for about two years. D.

An ominous warning is sounded against the spread of evolutionism within the Church of Christ by J. H. Tornell, in the *Lutheran Companion* (January 20), under the caption: "Where Tolerance Ceases to be a Virtue." He says: "It is not the opposition to evolution, but the evolution theory itself, which would so vitally affect the Church of Christ. Therefore, to adopt a new theory in place of the evolution theory would merely be taking the longest way around, which would only bring us a recurrence of difficulties, with new problems to solve. While there are many of us mortals here below who find it exceedingly difficult to concede Bible-truth, the rest of us find it equally impossible to accept scientific unbelief for anything over and above its face value. Confusion, pretense, and blundering may find its place in politics, but in the Church of Christ there is no room reserved. We regret that mistakes have been made in the name of the Church, yet it may be the only means of rousing a slumbering

Christianity. If the Church is to continue its function as a Christian institution, it must sooner or later suffer the abolishment of disbelief, and when this takes place, we realize as never before what gashes it will cut. It must be borne in mind that not all members of the Church are liberals; there are many who yet hold to the fact that treason is treason, not loyalty, and a traitor to his God is doubly dishonorable. There are many who have not rejected fundamental Christian truth for modern liberalism, where honest criticism is not tolerated and skepticism is held forth as being the cream of Christianity; these also are some of the errors committed in the name of the Church. (See Dr. Fosdick's statement in the December 2 issue.) 'God will not be mocked'; in due season He will surely purge His holy Church of all that is abominable in His sight, and when this process gets under way, it will profit no one in giving aid and comfort to the enemy." D.

Rome in Russia. — *Our Sunday Visitor* (January 21) reports that there are only 6,000,000 Catholics in Russia (population, 130,000,000), who are served by about 2,000 priests, 6 bishops, and 1 archbishop. "Because the people of Russian Poland, who were Catholics, frequently rebelled against Czar rule, the Catholic religion was bitterly persecuted at different times, and in 1864 all religious orders were suppressed. Following an edict of toleration, promulgated in 1905, 500,000 conversions occurred in two years. This success of the Church provoked new opposition and more hostile laws. Emigration from Russia to the United States was very heavy, beginning in 1902 until the World War. New York, with 1,500,000 Russians, has about one half the total number in this country." The writer calls the present Russian government "the merciless Soviet or Socialist (Bolshevik) rule," and, while branding it as antichristian, regards it as "the natural reaction from the slavery under Czardom." Rome hopes for much from present-day Russia. "Never before was the outlook so bright for the union of the Russian with the Catholic Church, and a stable government would promote such union. The Russian peasants, on the whole, are good and peaceable [mostly illiterates and full of superstitions and bigotry], and before the war were devoted alike to State and Church." In the new Baltic Republic, which maintains representatives or special emissaries at the Vatican, Rome is also pushing forward, and hopes to capture some of the old Lutheran churches. D.

Roman Diplomats in Europe. — At President Ebert's New Year's reception of foreign representatives at Berlin the Apostolic Nuncio, Mgr. Pacelli, acted as *doyen* of the diplomatic corps. He expressed "a fervent wish for peace, brotherly love, and justice," and the hope that the new year would advance the great family of men towards the goal for which the hearts of all men of good will are striving, and that with the solution of present tasks it would bring that satisfaction and security which are an earnest of order, industry, thrift, and progress. At a similar reception in Paris Mgr. Ceretti, acting as *doyen* of the diplomats, pointed out that the spirits and the hearts

of men must be demobilized before peace can be restored to the nations. This drew from Millerand a sharp rejoinder to the effect that peace could only be established on the basis of the Treaty of Versailles, otherwise it would be built up on lies and injustice. (*Sic!*) At Cologne Archbishop Dr. Schulte, in a New Year's proclamation, declared the Treaty of Versailles no peace treaty at all because consent to it had been wrested from Germany by force, and he warned the French that the "Rheinland" was German and proposed to remain German. D.

A small voice, but full of sound reasoning, was raised by eighteen women of Morrison, Mo., in a special dispatch to the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* (January 18), to this effect: "1. We, the women of America, are getting tired of paying the interest on the capital which we have lent to the allied powers. 2. We are getting tired of furnishing milk for those children and sick, which has been taken away from them by the allied powers. 3. We are tired of sending clothes and money to a people who are able to secure these for themselves if the opportunity to do this were not taken away from them by the allied powers. 4. We are tired of seeing that our efforts to aid the German and other nations are in vain because of the robbery carried on by the allied powers. 5. We are tired of seeing the homes of children, the aged, the sick, and the homeless without proper heat while coal is taken out of this country to a country where there is an abundant supply of fuel. We demand therefore that an immediate and sufficient supply of coal be furnished the German homes, and that export of coal to France cease until Germany has been fully supplied. Further, we demand that it may be made possible, through the intervention of our Government, that the opportunity may be given the German people to support themselves. In this connection we ask you to remember that our nation has declared that it fought the German Government, not its people." — In the same issue the editor argues, on legal grounds, that the view is correct that the Treaty of Versailles has been abrogated by the invasion of the Ruhr by France, and says: "Something will have to be done, and sooner or later the United States will have to take the leadership in doing it." Strange coincidence! If truths like these could only have been published four years sooner! They were just as true then. D.

Our "Exact" Science. — For use, eventually, we may file this report in the *Detroit Free Press* (April 24, 1922) of the closing session of the American Philosophical Society at Philadelphia. The question was concerning the age of the world. The *Free Press* said: "The answer of Prof. T. C. Chamberlain, of the University of Chicago, was between 70,000,000 and 150,000,000 years. He arrived at his conclusion, he said, by working with the methods of a geologist and presented readings from formations of the sea by various geologists. The answer of Prof. William Duane, of the Harvard Medical School, was between 8,000,000 and 1,700,000,000 years. His calculations, he said, were based on radioactivity. In estimating the age of the earth Professor Duane explained, as a 'clock,' some process in nature that

'moves in one direction only' should be used. Calculations from geological periods were not reliable, he said, because physical conditions were not the same and the periods of formation of geologic structures may have been rapid in some cases and slow in others. Likewise, he said, estimates based on the temperature of the earth or sun were not reliable because the temperature of a body may rise or fall. Geological calculations, Professor Chamberlain said, were made by finding the present rate at which sediments are formed, comparing this with sea formations supposed to have had their origin at the beginning of the earth. But for radioactivity, Professor Duane made the claim of dependability within reason. Radioactivity, the process by which one element transforms itself into one or more other elements, is not subject to any physical conditions, he declared. No one has been able to change the rate of this transformation, Professor Duane said, although repeated efforts have been made to do so. Speaking for the paleontologists Prof. John M. Clarke, director of the State museum at Albany, N. Y., said that he and his colleagues had always accepted the calculations of other branches of science and admitted that to make calculations from the periods of evolution of animal life was impossible." The difference between these calculations amounts to 1,692,000,000 years. And these scientists want to be taken seriously! Wonder whether they take themselves so, or whether they put on the old haruspex grin when they meet each other to enlighten the public and to feed a pen like that of Arthur Brisbane. D.

The Strange Logic of Dr. Steinmetz. — Commenting editorially on this subject, the *Catholic World* (February, 1923) writes: "The address of Dr. Steinmetz, on 'The Place of Religion in Modern Scientific Civilization' is one more illustration of the fact that a scientist, although supreme in his own element, may flounder hopelessly when he plunges into the deep water of philosophy and theology. The enthusiastic editor of the lecture declares that Dr. Steinmetz is 'probably the most learned figure in the world of electrical engineering.' But he is evidently something more than that. He lays claim to a knowledge of all philosophy; for he says, authoritatively, that 'Immanuel Kant is the greatest and most critical of all philosophers.' Surely, no scientist, trained in the inductive method, would make such a statement without having read and thoroughly studied all the philosophers. And he is also, presumably, a student of all theologies; for he speaks scarcely less authoritatively of Mohammed and Buddha and Moses and the 'founders of other religions,' including, of course, Christ. To lead the world in electrical engineering, while at the same time accumulating a thorough knowledge of all philosophies and all theologies, must require intense and prolonged application even for the most prodigious intellect. Curiously enough, however, the engineer-philosopher-theologian seems rather shaky in his logic. For example, he says: 'There has grown up through the centuries an increasing antagonism between science and religion, making the two *incompatible* with each other.' And: 'The conceptions of physical science are *incompatible* with the metaphysical conceptions of God, immortality,

infinity, etc.' But two pages beyond this latter sentence he says: 'Science and religion are not incompatible.' Incompatible, yet not incompatible. Is this a Kantian antinomy, or just a flat contradiction? Again he says: 'If we are honest, we must confess that in science there exists no God, no immortality, no soul. Scientifically, God and immortality are illogical conceptions. Science inevitably had to become atheistic.' That would seem to be final, at least for the scientist. But no; for he says, further on: 'The negative answer of science on immortality, God, etc., is not conclusive. The question is still open as it ever was.' To us Dr. Steinmetz's amphibologies are as bewildering as the dictum of Hegel: *'Das Sein und das Nichtsein, das ist dasselbe,'* 'To be means not to be.' As a theologian the 'most learned engineer' is even less felicitous than as a philosopher. See how speedily and how conclusively he ushers God out of the universe! 'The terror of the thunderstorm led primitive man to the conception of a Supreme Being, whose attribute was the thunderbolt. But when Franklin brought the lightning from the clouds, and showed it to be a mere electric spark; when we learned to make lightning harmless by the lightning-rod, and when, finally, we harnessed electricity to do our work, naturally our reverence for the power of the thunderbolt decayed. So the gods of experience vanished.' *'So!' Just* so. It is all very simple — and very striking. But there are — or there were — other arguments for the existence of God, besides the argument from thunder and lightning. Among these was the 'argument from design,' which (permitting Dr. Steinmetz to define it in his own words), is that 'the wonderful fitness of nature gave argument for the conception of a Supreme Being, who had made everything in nature so perfectly fitting its purpose.' That argument, or that idea, is as old as human thought. But Dr. Steinmetz asserts that it was demolished by Darwin, who, he says, 'gave a ridiculously simple explanation of the fitness of nature by showing that only the fit can survive, and anything unfit is rapidly exterminated. . . . Thus no evidence, or proof, of the existence of God has been found in the phenomena of nature.' Surely that is swift and reckless logic. But getting rid of God is not so 'ridiculously simple.' Dr. James J. Walsh, in the October number of this magazine, quotes the late Professor Cope of the University of Pennsylvania, who used to say: 'What we are interested in is not the *survival* of the fittest, but the *origin* of the fittest. Until you explain origins without God, you have not made God unnecessary.' There is an occasional note of bitterness in the address under discussion, unworthy of a dispassionate scientist. After declaring that Darwin's discoveries destroyed the 'argument from design,' Dr. Steinmetz says: 'Therefore the hatred of all the forces of darkness against the theory of evolution.' The Doctor may think it clever to use the Scriptural phrase 'the forces of darkness' to designate those who believe in God, but when he imputes vicious motives to those who disagree with him, he is unscientific. Is it not conceivable that a man should oppose materialistic evolution out of devotion to what he thinks to be the truth? But whatever be the spirit of science, the Doctor must have

his little sarcastic flings. He speaks of 'semicivilized countries, such as attempt to forbid by legislation the teaching of evolution in State universities.' Perhaps Kentucky is not the apex of wisdom, but when Dr. Steinmetz inferentially refers to that State as 'semicivilized,' he is only calling names; he is doing something eminently unworthy of 'the most learned figure in the world of electrical engineering.' Finally, Dr. Steinmetz commits the 'suicide of reason.' He removes the ground from under his own feet, and he is swallowed up. And with him, if his words be true, all science disappears. He explains that 'science derives its conclusions from the sense perceptions by the laws of logic,' and in the next breath he asks: 'But what proof is there of the correctness of the laws of logic?' If there is no proof of the correctness of the laws of logic, all thinking is nugatory, all argument is futile, and all science is impossible. Science is logic applied to facts. If logic be uncertain, there remain only the facts. And an aggregation of facts can never be a science. We should never have believed that Dr. Steinmetz could do science so ill a turn. Perhaps he had better stick to his dynamos and his artificial lightning and leave Immanuel Kant alone." MUELLER.

The Cocksure Mr. Scientist. — The cocksure Mr. Scientist is taken to task by the same periodical *(Catholic World)*, which declares: "But the typical 'scientific' person is cocksure. His opinions are clear-cut and irreformable. He knows what he knows, and he is impatient of all who disagree with him. He challenges religion to say what it has ever done for mankind, and he knows beforehand that religion has no word to say to justify its existence. His devotion to science seems to demand that he deride religion. To him there is not room for science and religion in this big universe. There is place only for science. 'The fundamental dogma of all materialistic science is that all the phenomena of life, including the poetry of Shakespeare and Wordsworth, the reasonings of Aristotle, a Sir Isaac Newton, and all minor manifestations of life can be explained, and some day will be explained, in terms of chemical equations and physical experiments.' (Windle, *Facts and Theories*, p. 56.) There is an old phrase about measuring all things with a yardstick. It is just as absurd to imagine that all things can be analyzed in a test-tube. 'There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamt of in your philosophy.' And there are more things in heaven and earth than can be investigated in your laboratories. There are things in human life and in human nature that cannot be ground in a mortar with a pestle or boiled with a Bunsen burner. As the same newspaper writer says, there are 'mysteries of which there is no rule-of-thumb solution.'" MUELLER.

A national searching of hearts seems to be impending as to our "moral obligation" in, or resulting from, the late war, if reports from Washington and newspaper editorials all over the country are to be credited. This concerns every citizen of our country. Rummaging in old files, we found the following editorial on "Underlying Causes" from the *Detroit News* of July 26, 1917, which may serve as food for

reflection: "Often it is difficult to formulate the purposes of a great movement. The causes first assigned gradually grow dim, and new reasons appear which seem more logical and more worthy. Great Britain entered the war of the nations ostensibly because Belgium was violated and she was a guarantor of Belgium's neutrality. Of course, she had guaranteed Belgium's neutrality because a small nation on the North Sea did not threaten her own trade supremacy, while Germany, as possessor of Antwerp, would. But that was neither here nor there. Britain, because it served her purposes, had guaranteed Belgium; so when the war began, she could afford to stand up for the rights of small nations. Russia entered the war because Austria was pressing humiliating demands on Serbia, a Slavic nation. Russia's ambition to control the destinies of the Slavs in the Balkans could not allow Austria to obtain an advantage there in addition to those which the southward-pushing policy of the dual monarchy had already secured in Bosnia and Herzegovina. France entered the war partly because she was bound to do so as Russia's ally, partly because Germany's refusal to recognize Belgium's neutrality was a threat that could not be ignored. Now these aims have been almost forgotten. The allies in Europe are fighting, not for the restoration of Belgium, but for the crushing of a system which, they feel, is a menace to their safety as long as it exists. Russia has even renounced the predominance in the Balkans which made her take Serbia's part. The war party in the United States first pleaded that our Government take action because Belgium had been violated. When this failed, they sought a reason for entering the war in the sinking of the *Lusitania*. When we finally did recognize a state of war as existing, it was on neither of these grounds, nor for the specific reason that our ships of trade had been sunk illegally. We entered on the broad ground that the world must be safe for democracy, and could not be safe while Germany was controlled by the powers which now rule her. This is a far cry from the motives which were assigned in 1914; but is it not fundamental? Our own Civil War began as a war to preserve the Union, to insist that no State could secede from the nation. Yet by the end of 1862 it had become, as much as anything, a war to abolish slavery. Secession was the proximate cause; but the reason for secession was the existence of slavery. With the underlying cause out of the way and its supporters rendered helpless, the nation could begin rebuilding in the confidence that there could never be another outbreak of the kind. So in this war we have found that all the causes first assigned were inadequate, and that the all-inclusive motive, the motive which is to guide the reconstruction of Europe and of the war-torn world, is the right of a people to live after its own fashion, to govern itself as it pleases, as long as it does not interfere with any other people. But if a nation falls under the control of a small, but powerful class, and prepares an army and navy to secure for herself a place in the sun, and announces plans for the acquisition of world supremacy, she menaces all the rest of the world, and the world must unite to maintain its integrity. The objects of this war will not be

won if no international organization is formed to keep the world in order. Germany is the menace to-day, but who can say that it will not be some other nation fifty years hence?" D.

Ignorance of the Bible in Colleges. — On this issue the *Catholic World* offers the following comment: "Some years ago experiments were made at various universities to discover what the students knew of the Bible. The results were both ludicrous and scandalous. In one of the experiments, conducted at the University of Michigan, the following amazing information was unearthed: 'Jordan was the name of the man who took Moses' place.' 'Sinai was the mount from which Christ spoke.' 'The Temple of Solomon was in Babylon.' 'Levi was a man; Leviathan was a follower of this man.' 'Levi was a Jewish male, Leviathan a woman.' 'Levi was a priest; Leviathan was a law laid down by the priests.' 'Christ was crucified at the age of twenty-one.' 'Christ lived to a good old age.' 'The Gospel were the letters which St. Paul wrote to the churches.' That leaves the epistles to be explained. Perhaps the student thought that the epistles were the wives of apostles. 'In the New Testament every chapter is by a different man,' while in the Old Testament 'all the chapters were written by one man.' 'The language of the New Testament is more modern than that of the Old.' It may have been this scholar who first discovered that the 'Bible was written B. C., parts of it before B. C.'" MUELLER.

The Eternal Problem of Sermonizing. — Quoting the *Expositor* (Cleveland), the *Biblical Review* (January, 1923) shows an experienced preacher's method of solving the difficult problem of sermonizing. The method of this preacher is as follows: "When I have found my theme, subject, or text, I dedicate myself to uninterrupted, world-forgetting reflection and meditation; then, as said the psalmist, 'while I muse, the fire burns'; and when the fire of my heart, my soul, begins to flame up, I seize my pen and rush into writing; I write and write and write, slamming down (so to speak) thoughts, thoughts, thoughts, as they come to me. And they come to me in troops, rush upon me in mass. I write with speed, not considering either logical order or sermonic form, nor anything else except just to jot down thoughts, put down points, fasten somehow the rushing stream of ideas safely to the page, 'holding wide my skirts while the heavens rain gold,' as says the poet. I write, it may be, an hour, two hours, or only thirty, fifteen, ten minutes, all depending on how long the heavens rain gold. But just as soon as the river of thoughts, of ideas, of visions, runs dry, I fling the pen to one side without reading or even glancing at that which I have written, and rush out of doors. After a time the river of thoughts begins to run flood-tide again, and again I hasten to my desk to write, until at last no more inspiring thoughts come. Then my day's work is ended. I never attempt to pump water out of a dry well instead of dipping it up from a living, flowing spring. The day following I read with great care everything I have written; I arrange and collocate all the thoughts in severest logical order; I write with greatest pains a full outline of my thoughts, illustrations, quotations,

and make a perfect skeleton of all the material of my sermon; and from then on I think and think, I pray and muse, I write and pray, until my whole soul is aflame and impassioned with the divine truth, the message which God has given me for my people. Then I go to my pulpit, without speaking with anybody, avoiding, if I can, all human companions, and doing nothing save think and pray in my heart concerning that message. Those last few moments before preaching are purest gold to me, and must not be tarnished by profane fingers. In the pulpit the whole sermon, not its words, but its entire thought structure and living form, stands in front of my eyes absolutely clear. I hardly try to remember, rather, I cannot forget. I cannot break down, I cannot go wandering from my subject. Then, confiding in God alone, praying ever in my heart of hearts, I preach — I preach with all my force, all my heart, all my soul. And I am a free man in my pulpit. Freed from the chains of a manuscript which I have to read with bending head and fixed eyes; free from the slavery of thousands of words committed to memory and ever trying to escape me; free from the rope-halter of a written outline placed on the pulpit before me, and from which I must not move far, even to find fresh pastures or drink of bright, bubbling waters; yes, I am free to preach as a prophet of God, an ambassador of His eternal truth."

MUELLER.

British Spleen. — At the celebration of the 78th anniversary of St. George's Society of Ottawa there was much glorification of Englishmen. Telegrams were received from all over the world. At the roll call every member rose and stated the country from which either he or his forebears were descended. Hon. H. H. Stevens, M. P. for Vancouver Center, speaking on "England," declared the charter wrung from King John the basis of all modern government and Lloyd George the hope of humanity. Rev. W. S. Heathcote, a visitor from New Zealand, held that "all other races are nature's failure in the attempt to make an Englishman." (*Ottawa Journal,* April 25.) — A dispatch from Toronto (October 26) reported: —

"'King George is as clearly descended from King David as you are from your grandfathers,' declared Lieut.-Col. W. G. Mackendrick, D. S. O., in an address to the Empire Club here to-day on 'Allenby's campaign, as laid down in the Bible.' Colonel Mackendrick said the Prince of Wales was Christened 'David' in anticipation of days to come, and he quoted 'My servant David shall rule from Jerusalem' as Biblical substantiation of this. Other Biblical quotations were interpreted by Colonel Mackendrick as relating to Great Britain and the British Empire.

"'Christ came to the world,' Colonel Mackendrick said, 'not to save the world, but to save the lost sheep of Israel. Those lost sheep were our forefathers. The house of David was promised an earthly throne forever. They have it. It is the throne of Great Britain.'

"Colonel Mackendrick said the capture of Jerusalem was effected by prayer. General Allenby and his staff were on their knees praying for guidance, he explained, when the Patriarch of Jerusalem entered their camp with a white flag.

"'Wherever you see "Israel" in the Bible, read "the British Empire,"' said Colonel Mackendrick." D.

The Value of the Religious Paper. — That there ought to be a great crusade in behalf of the religious papers is the contention of the *Biblical Review* (January, 1923), which quotes Dr. Frederick F. Shannon, pastor of Central Church, Chicago, as follows: "Who can measure the power for right and wrong our newspapers wield? There are a few really great independent papers in the world. But in thinking of the average metropolitan daily, I am invariably reminded of a Joseph's coat of many colors — with no Joseph inside the coat; or, varying the metaphor, I am reminded of the voice of Jacob, the hand of Esau, and the silver of Judas Iscariot. But there is another type of journalism for which too much cannot be said. I mean that large number of denominational and undenominational Christian weeklies. They are the salt of our journalistic earth. Most of them are published at a financial loss; a few with, perhaps, a slender margin of profit. Let this be said to our shame! Without the inspiring tides of idealism constantly poured into the world's life by our Christian editors, we should suffer untold loss in our politics, schools, homes, and churches. They are solvents of civilization. They clear the atmosphere. They lift discussion out of partisan muck up to the prophetic mountains. I think every man who reads his partisan daily — Republican, Democrat, Socialist — would greatly profit by seriously reading some one of the fine and definitely Christian weeklies. They are an antidote to rabid nationalism; they are an offset to violent partisanship; they foster an atmosphere of brotherhood and world vision." MUELLER.

Concerning Eugenics. — What eugenics is the same quarterly shows by quoting the history of the Edwards family, published years ago in the *Ladies' Home Journal*. We read: "What is eugenics? some ask. It is perhaps best told in the story of one man: He was born in England, in Queen Elizabeth's time. He was a clergyman, and he lived an upright life. So did his wife. His son came to the United States, to Hartford, Conn., and became an honorable merchant. His son, in turn, also became a merchant, upright and honored. His son, again, became a minister, and so honored was he that Harvard University conferred two degrees on him on the same day — one in the morning and one in the afternoon. This learned man, again, had a son, and he became a minister. Jonathan Edwards was his name. Now, let us see, in 1900, what this one family, started by a man in England who lived an upright life and gave that heritage to his children, produced. 1,394 descendants of this man have been traced and identified; 295 were college graduates; 13 were college presidents; 65 were professors; 60 were physicians; 108 were clergymen; 101 were lawyers; 30 were judges; 1 was Vice-President of the United States; 75 were Army and Navy officers; 60 were prominent authors; 16 were railroad and steamship presidents. And in the entire record not one has ever been convicted of a crime. It seems to pay — this living along upright lines and handing a clean life down to one's children, doesn't it?" MUELLER.

BOOK REVIEW.

American Luther League, Barr and Madison Sts., Fort Wayne, Ind.: —

American Principles and Private Schools. *J. C. Baur.* 16 pages.

In succinct statements the secretary of the A. L. L. here reviews the unhappy condition that has been, or would be, created by the present propaganda to secure for the state a monopoly in education. Parental rights, religious liberty, and freedom in education are invaded by this utterly un-American movement. The grievance of loyal Americans has been clearly stated, and the dangers to our fundamental bill of rights tersely told, in this small and well-digested essay. D.

Augustana Book Concern, Rock Island, Ill.: —

Christian Dogmatics and Notes on the History of Dogma. *Conrad Emil Lindberg, D. D., LL. D.* Translated from the Swedish by *Rev. C. E. Hoffsten, B. D.* Revised and augmented by the author. 602 pages.

The field of English dogmatics has not been tilled overmuch as yet by Lutheran theologians. This is one reason, though it be a superficial one, why this new addition by Dr. Lindberg to our scanty stock of textbooks on dogmatics will be welcomed. It is true pioneer work which every writer on this subject in the English Lutheran Church is doing. Moreover, there is in this book a Lutheran flavor. The Lutheran Confessions (except the Smalcald Articles and Luther's Catechisms) are cited and referred to in connection with some of the principal teachings of the Lutheran Church. Likewise, frequently an attempt is made, chiefly in the sections on the history of dogma, to sketch the teaching of Luther. The confines of the book may have prohibited copious quotations, but especially in English treatises of this kind they would have been very desirable, partly in order better to acquaint the English Lutheran Church with the efficient τρόπος παιδείας of her greatest teacher, partly to repel current misconceptions and misinterpretations of Luther's teaching. Some of the materials in this book might have been omitted to make room for excerpts from Luther's writings. Lastly, the author has throughout tried to familiarize his students, for whom his treatise was chiefly written and to whom it is dedicated, with the time-honored dogmatic school-terms used in the Latin dogmatics of Gerhard, Baier (Walther's edition), and Hollaz and adopted also by Heinrich Schmid. — At convenient points the author has interrupted his presentation of dogmatic material to insert notes on the history of dogma. He devotes about 130 pages to these brief *excursus*. His arrangement of topics follows, upon the whole, the established order in the Lutheran Church. There are no Prolegomena. Natural Theology is treated in the chapter on God and Bibliology in the chapter on the Church. The Person of Christ, including the states, is presented under the head of Christology, the threefold office of Christ under that of Soteriology. In the chapter on Pneumatology, starting out with the concept of grace, the order of salvation, from vocation to preservation (conservation the author prefers to call it), is treated. The means of grace are discussed in Ecclesiology, which opens with the definition of the Church and closes with the doctrine of the ministry. The treatise on the angels has been embodied

in the chapter on God. As the author regards dogmatics as "that science which systematically develops and defines the Christian dogmas mediated by faith in conformity with the teaching of the Bible and the Church," he places exegetical and historical before systematic theology. The arrangement of the sequences between the departments of theology is not of great moment by itself, but there is a certain logic in whatever sequence is adopted. In this instance the logic is that the Christian dogmas grow out of the divine revelation and the faith of the Church. This is liable to misunderstanding. The dogma comes from God alone, in and with His revelation, and is offered for men's acceptation. Exegesis can merely help to show that the dogma is there, and very little exegesis — unless we extend the meaning of the term very much — is necessary for exhibiting the dogma. The Church, by its creeds, adds nothing to the dogma, but simply exhibits its faithfulness to the sovereign teaching of God. The principal use of dogmatics is to state comprehensively what has been revealed regarding any one dogma, to show the connection of dogmas, if any connection has been revealed, and to defend each dogma against misinterpretation. Whatever system there is applied in dogmatics must also be drawn from Scripture, or a foreign element is injected into the *corpus doctrinae*. As the author says, the dogmatician's system, developments, and definitions must answer to the Biblical form. — Perhaps we cannot dispense with the mention of the various attempts that have been made at establishing the existence of God from natural principles. Theological students must be acquainted with them, but they are no part of a theology that is based entirely on revelation. Nor must too great value be attached to philosophical arguments of this sort: the comfort which they yield in spiritual trials is not real. — Luther's "sanction" of the distinction between the secret and the revealed will of God does not mean a distinction between a *voluntas seria et efficax* and a *voluntas non seria*. (p. 56.) — The author's presentation of the doctrine of predestination in the strict sense is a most unsatisfactory chapter. (pp. 86—103.) First the author wants predestination and election kept apart as not logically synonymous, and then he offers the identical definition for both, and calls them a "conditioned decree of God." "Election depends upon the attitude of man." It is related to God's foreknowledge of man's attitude and therefore has its correlate in reprobation. "The phrase 'election in view of faith' does not necessarily imply synergism." Well, then, it should be shown now just what the phrase does mean. It is neither a Scriptural nor a confessional phrase, and synergists do love it. "The cause of salvation is *sola gratia*, but only believers will be saved. If God wills that all should be saved by grace through faith, would not God save every one if it were possible? As the Holy Spirit works faith, why do not all men believe? Should we say that the reason is a mystery? We know that men resist the Holy Spirit, but why do some give up resistance? Is the grace of God irresistible? But such belief would be Calvinism," etc. Can you imagine that a Lutheran theologian in America can still write thus after what has happened in 1880 and after? "Faithfulness unto death is not the consequence of predestination or election, but the condition of election." Here the author, in fairness to his students, ought to have pointed out that only persons who have died in faith, hence those who have gone to

heaven, have been elected. For what? To go to heaven! The teaching of the Missouri Synod is characterized as "a view that partly may imply Calvinism and Amyraldism in the actual result," and the protest of the Missourians against this charge is noted. Evidently the author does not respect the protest, however. He has disgraced his book by citing as his primary authority on the teaching of the Missouri Synod — Tressel's *The Error of Missouri*. But he would also call attention to a booklet written by Dr. F. Pieper (*Conversion and Election*), with which he finds fault because it does not explain "why the Spirit works faith in some except as God has elected them." — Dr. Lindberg undertakes to sketch Luther's "stern" doctrine in *De Servo Arbitrio* as a doctrine that excludes "all by grace." We are bound to believe that Dr. Lindberg speaks from personal study of Luther's famous treatise, and should like very much to see him substantiate, in a second edition of his book, from *De Servo Arbitrio* what he has said about Luther. Likewise should we wish to see him prove that the Formula of Concord "treats of the doctrine of election principally in a broad sense." — If anybody thinks he can accomplish much with Kurtz's attempt at harmonizing the Biblical account of creation with modern science, he has our sympathy. — In speaking of Human Freedom and the Grace of God, the author rightly opposes determinism, but he fails to make plain the difference which he has in mind between determinism and prevenient grace. The great question at this point is: Has man any power by nature to receive the grace of God in this "incipient activity"? In this connection the author's statement: "He that has been baptized has at one time possessed an *arbitrium liberatum*, or liberated will, and is therefore continually an object of special grace," requires an explanation to save it from the imputation of Calvinistic *gratia inamissibilis*. — Since the author rightly declines the view that the incarnation of Christ would have taken place regardless of man's sin, it seems to us he should avoid the phraseology of those who hold this view, *viz.:* "The Son of God was the eternal prototype of humanity, indeed, the ideal man." (p. 190 f.) This view raises the question, Was Adam created in the image of Christ? — The theologians who would add to the three genera of communication of attributes a *genus tapeinotikon*, we think, are the neo-Lutherans like Kahnis. (p. 216.) It should have been stated that this view is utterly unscriptural and destroys the personal union of the natures in Christ. — On p. 297 the author speaks of *gratia operans* as that act by which "the Holy Spirit imparts the powers of faith." The distinction between the act of believing and the ability for that act seems to be intended here. It is an impossible distinction, and no Scripture is cited for it. — The author repeats the hackneyed charge of modern theologians that in the teaching regarding the inspiration of the Scripture the old dogmaticians, "who held to the mechanical theory," "overemphasized the divine influence" and "repressed the human element, which resulted in a sort of monophysitism." Can Dr. Lindberg or any one else guide us to an unerring division of the two natures of the Bible, so that we can at least set apart those portions in it that are not of God? That would confer a real benefit on men — if Dr. Lindberg and others are right in their belief of the dual nature of the Scriptures. — In his remarks on the Office of the Ministry the author sketches the position of the Missouri Synod and that of the

Iowa Synod, and sets over against both of them the position of the Augustana Synod, p. 481, as "a true, Lutheran, and confessional position"; but he fails to indicate the exact position of the Swedish Synod on the point in controversy, the relation of the ministry to the universal priesthood of believers. By the way, in the teaching of Missouri the universal priesthood of believers with its functions and the ministerial office with its functions are two distinct matters, and ordained as distinct by God. — We have not the space to go more deeply into a criticism of various positions taken in this text-book. But to aid in rendering a future print more accurate, we would call attention to p. 26, where physico-theological and historico-theological are evidently placed for physico-teleological, etc. It is best, in Christology, to use "deity" for "divinity" when speaking of the divine nature of Christ. Modern rationalism has taught us the distinction between the two terms. On p. 229 κρήσεως must be changed to κτήσεως. Kenotics, on p. 194, should be changed to Kenotists or Kenoticists, whichever the author had in mind. On p. 386 there is a brachylogy that renders the meaning obscure: "Thus the means of grace not only declare the grace of God, they are also the bearers and means for its inspiration." What does "its" refer to? and what is "inspiration"? D.

Swedish Composition and Word Study. *Edw. J. Vickner.*

This book is intended for students who have finished elementary grades in Swedish grammar and for such as are deficient in grammar while possessing some reading knowledge of Swedish. It combines a thorough review of the essential principles of Swedish grammar with a practical course in composition and conversation, and contains constant references to Vickner's *Brief Swedish Grammar*. The lessons are simple and brief, the selections interesting, and the dialogs practical. Special emphasis is laid upon grammar drill. A practical help for those interested in the study of Swedish. MUELLER.

Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn.: —

Luther College through Sixty Years. (1861—1921.) The Luther College Faculty, Decorah, Iowa. 512 pages; 260 illustrations. $3.00.

Luther College through Sixty Years presents the history of Luther College from the time of its origin to the conclusion of the sixtieth anniversary festivity, and thus offers to the reader a most interesting collection of historical material pertaining to this prominent school of the United Norwegian Lutheran Church. Since for many years the faculty and graduates of Luther College were intimately connected with the Missouri Synod, this book possesses more than a passing interest for pastors connected with our Synod. Its teachers and graduates were at one time closely connected with our Concordia Theological Seminary at St. Louis, and the influence of this contact is plainly visible in the molding of the school, its curriculum and its graduates. The general make-up of the book is excellent. The editors, O. M. Norlie, O. A. Tingelstad, and Carl T. Jacobsen, worked under authorization and instruction from the faculty of the college. Contributions for the volume have been furnished by seventeen professors in addition to those furnished by members of the editorial staff. Besides 512 pages of valuable information, there are 260 illustrations.

Paper, print, illustrations, cover, etc., as well as the general appearance of the Jubilee volume constitute a beautiful expression of the feeling of just pride suggested by the contemplation of the sixty years of successful work, constant growth, and splendid results. The book is a valuable contribution to the history of the American Lutheran Church. MUELLER.

Suomen Lutherilainen Ewankeliumiyhdistys, Helsinki, Finland: —

M. Luther, Autuuden laehteillae Selityksiae wanhatestamentillisiin teksteihin. Toimitti *A. E. Koskenniemi.*

The pastor of St. Michael's Evangelical Lutheran Church at Aabo, Finland, here offers 71 selected passages from Luther's expository writings on Old Testament texts. They have been rendered from the Weimar edition of Luther's Works and from Eberlen's edition of Luther's Exposition of the Psalms. They are intended for use at private devotion and at "reading-services." This publication is one out of more than fifty similar ones that are disseminated in Finland, and give evidence of the Lutheran consciousness of many Finns. D.

The Penn Publishing Co., Philadelphia: —

The Morals of the Movie. *Ellis Paxson Oberholtzer, Ph. D., Litt. D.* 251 pages, 5×7¾. $1.25. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Every one who would be thoroughly informed as to the "movie" and receive such information at first hand ought to buy and read this book. The author, Dr. Oberholtzer, was for six years a member of the Pennsylvania State Board of Censors. He therefore thoroughly knows his subject. In his preface he says: "My purpose in this place is rather to point out the wrong in film; describe with a plainness which, I hope, will not do offense, its character, that the magnitude of the evil may be appreciated; direct my readers' minds to the remedy which has been applied in other countries, and in some degree in this country; and gird the loins of those of failing courage, if there be such, for going on with the contest with this abomination, until we shall see no more of it in the land, or for export to falsify our civilization and to advertise our low moral standards to the outside world." As to the standard which ought to be applied, Dr. Oberholtzer says: " I do not pretend to think that all film should pass through a cologne water bath before it be sent out on its tour in its tin box. It need not be purified and sweetened until it is fit to rest amid the lavender in our grandmother's *mouchoir* box. That is not my hope, expectation, or desire as an observer and critic of the moving-picture situation. Sugary, ladylike film, warranted not to harm the littlest child, is not what any of us ask for. We wish simply that it shall be decent, as decent as the life around us, the life we move in and are a part of." We add a few more quotations from the book: "A large London exhibitor told the British Cinema Commission that, if he should give up more than fifteen minutes in a two-hour entertainment to 'educational' pictures, he would 'bore many people and get many complaints.'" "Sex is the one potently dominant idea in the minds of the men who are gambling in the public taste for

nasty photographic stories." "'I do not think, I know,' says Warden McKenty of the Eastern Penitentiary of Pennsylvania, 'that criminals are made in the picture houses. I study the cases of those who come to me. I ask the men how they were started on the paths which brought them to me, and they say through the moving picture.'" "Does any one suppose, will any one for a moment seriously contend, that this opening up of the theater to the child — it would have been an unheard-of and an impossible proposal twenty-five years ago — has been without the most profound influence upon our civilization? I can think of nothing in the social development so revolutionary as this." "The managers of 'family theaters' have been asked to devote one afternoon a week, perhaps, to the showing of pictures which parents would like their children to see. It is a worthy enthusiasm, though some, I feel certain, have come away from the experience in discouragement. They have found, as we censors very well know, that there is not much film good for children, which, at the same time, is entertaining to children. Like the commendable movement to show motion pictures in churches and schools, the children's program in the theater has suffered for want of an adequate supply." The table of contents of the book reads: Does the Moving Picture Move? Sex Pictures; Melodrama; Serials and "Comics"; Children in the Picture House; The Judgment of the World; American Censor Boards; The Attitude of the Industry; The Picture in Politics; Appendix.

We strongly recommend that every pastor and teacher purchase a copy of this book. FRITZ.

Constructive Press, Room 426, 500 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.: —

Science: Aid to Faith. 1. The Contribution of Biology. *Augusta Gaskell.*

This is one of a series of scientific investigations published by the Constructive Press of New York for the purpose of utilizing the facts of science to confirm faith in the teachings of Christianity. In this essay Miss Augusta Gaskell, the authoress, endeavors to prove that belief in the physiological event of the virgin birth is entirely congruous with the most advanced findings of science, and that modern science affirms nothing that discredits the doctrine of the virgin birth. She arrives at the conclusion that "without mental reservation and with all intellectual honesty, as well as with deepest reverence, one may say: I believe that Jesus was 'born of Mary the Virgin.'"

With regard to artificial parthenogenesis Miss Gaskell writes: "It may be remarked that among specialists in research upon artificial parthenogenesis as among specialists in research upon rays these experiments and results occasioned no great surprise; for the fertilizing power of rays, or fertilization by rays, is only one specific effect among many other observed specific effects of rays." Again: "G. Bohn produced artificial parthenogenesis in Strongylocentrotus lividus eggs exposing them to radium rays, and Loeb caused the eggs of Arbacia and Chaetopterus to segment by exposing them to ultraviolet radiations from a quartz mercury arc. In other words, it is the instability of the physiological mechanism rather than the wave length of the radiation used which determines the nature of the physiological effect produced."

After all has been said, the virgin birth of Jesus Christ remains a miracle, that is, an event which did not take place in agreement with the ordinary laws of nature governing conception and birth; hence it cannot be explained by biological data. MUELLER.

The Macmillan Co., New York, N. Y.: —

The Religion of the Primitives. *Mgr. A. Le Roy.* Translated from the French by *Rev. Newton Thompson.* 344 pages, including 10 pages of preface. $2.50.

Mgr. A. Le Roy's book is a most interesting study of ethnic religions. Having lived for many years as missionary among the savages of Africa, he was enabled to become well acquainted with the religious ideas and cults of primitive tribes. In his book the author compares the fundamental ideas of savage paganism with the fundamental concepts of the Christian religion, and arrives at the conclusion that primitives, in spite of their polytheism, possess a clear conception of one personal God, of a distinct morality, of sin, and of a definite method of atoning for sin, etc. The conclusions which the writer reaches are in consonance with the truth set forth by St. Paul in Romans, chaps. 1 and 2. Of particular interest are the chapters on Belief, Morality, Worship, and Magic. Relative to God, the author writes: "It is certainly striking that the most primitive tribes have a notion of God which is the more precise according as they are more uncivilized. Such are the Negrillos of Africa, the San, the Andamans, the Australians. Some way must be found to explain the origin of the idea of God; hence a vast quantity of theories, the mere exposition of which would furnish material for a large work." Again: "In the minds of our Negrillos and Bantus, Mulungu (*i. e.*, God) is certainly not the sky — dry or rainy — nor the light nor the sun nor the moon nor the wind nor the water nor the earth, and so on. He is in all of them; He acts in and by all these elements; He is sometimes assimilated to them, but His personality is distinctly separate from them: *He is something else.* God is not in their minds the 'power' (totemistic or otherwise) of nature or society, in the sense that our philosophers and sociologists mean it; this refined, critical idea is altogether foreign to our poor savages. God is not conceived by them as the 'Principle of Good' in opposition to a 'Principle of Evil,' whose effects would appear to our eyes and for which our mind would seek a cause; that, too, is an idea that is not in vogue in the black country. God is not to them a deified chief. The Negrillos have no chief, they do not claim any special ancestor; but they have a very precise idea of God. God is not to them a 'spirit,' neither the 'spirit' of a dead man nor an independent 'spirit'; He is conceived as anterior to death, as having never died Himself; and He it is precisely who commands life. He has nothing to do with the spirits, genii, or demons; these latter, among the Bantus, are not considered as intermediaries between man and the Divinity. We repeat that the Bantus are not polytheists and do not conceive God as the chief or king of the gods. He is outside of all that. Among the Blacks, God does not come from an abstract union in one personality of the multitude of powers and qualities attributed to different spirits, nor from the necessity of giving a president to the assembly of inferior divinities, nor from any like conception. Once again, we repeat, these ideas proceed from

speculations to which the black world is a total stranger." In the final chapter Mgr. Le Roy concludes: "In its general make-up the human species is essentially religious and *fundamentally Catholic.*" "From this inquiry the Catholic religion emerges in triumph." "Its elements include all that is true, just, and good in the various religious forms of the world, to the exclusion of all magical, mythological, superstitious, or simply useless alloys." "She alone has been able to adapt herself to the most varied civilizations, the humblest as well as the highest, to all countries, all climates, all races, all political forms, all intellects, all consciences." "She alone fully answers the needs of the mind and heart, pointing man to a line of conduct, an end, a destiny that makes life intelligible and really worth being lived."

This eulogy on the Catholic religion is at the same time its condemnation. Mgr. Le Roy finds that the ultimate religious ideas and practises of the primitives agree with those of Catholicism. To the reader the point of congruity is clear, at least as far as the method of obtaining salvation is concerned. Paganism and Catholicism agree in securing salvation for sinners by work-righteousness. Accordingly, the converts to Catholicism from primitive tribes have ever remained essentially paganistic.

MUELLER.

The Country Faith. *Frederick F. Shannon,* minister of Central Church, Chicago. 135 pages, 5×7. $1.00.

In *The Country Faith* Frederick F. Shannon offers a series of discourses that may well serve as a pattern of present-day sectarian preaching. Dr. Shannon's sermons have been characterized as brilliant and illuminating; yet they exhibit all the faults of that kind of preaching which does not endeavor first of all to proclaim the pure and unadulterated truths of the Gospel. In the sermons presented in this volume the Lutheran pastor finds little to learn, still less to imitate, and much to criticize. MUELLER.

Macmillan Co., London: —

In the Footsteps of the Master. Sermon Outlines on St. Mark's Gospel. *J. H. B. Masterman, M. A.*

This is a collection of sermon outlines on the Gospel according to St. Mark. As a practical help to the busy pastor we believe the outlines to be of negligible benefit. Neither in form nor content do they conform to the patterns of Lutheran Gospel-preaching. MUELLER.

Fleming H. Revell Co., 158 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.: —

What Shall I Believe? *Augustus Hopkins Strong, D. D., LL. D.,* late President-Emeritus, Rochester Theological Seminary. $1.00, net.

In his *Primer of Christian Theology,* Dr. A. H. Strong offers to the reader a brief popular statement of his faith, a condensation of the principles discussed at length in his *Systematic Theology.* For many years Dr. Strong occupied a unique position among American theologians. Adhering to the fundamentals of Christian doctrine, he nevertheless mediated between the Liberals and the Fundamentalists. This position he defends in the preface as follows: —

"I would make it a positive and constructive statement rather than a refutation or denunciation of false doctrine. I desire to recognize whatever of truth there is in the theory of evolution and in the conclusion of the higher criticism. But I have felt bound to show that there is a downward as well as an upward evolution, and that the higher criticism is not supreme arbiter in the interpretation of Scripture, but that it must be accompanied and qualified by the insight furnished by the Spirit of God. Modern literature furnishes us with methods of composition which are unhistorical, yet well fitted to convey essential truth. I have used these to show the possibility of their use in the composition of the Old Testament. I hold, therefore, middle ground between the higher critics and the so-called Fundamentalists, and believe it possible for them both to reconcile their differences by a larger view of the deity and omnipresence of Christ. He is 'our Peace,' and He holds in His girdle the key to all our problems."

Dr. Strong thus classifies himself among the "Evangelicals." However, the position of the Evangelical is impossible, as clearly shown in Dr. Strong's *Primer*. Endeavoring to hold to the fundamentals of the Christian faith, his views on every fundamental of the Christian religion, such as the infallibility and authority of Scriptures, the holy Trinity, the atonement, conversion, the means of grace, etc., are saturated with error. In view of these facts, the *Primer* is a real disappointment to the orthodox Bible student. MUELLER.

J. C. Heinrichssche Buchhandlung, Leipzig, Germany: —

Hebrew Tribal Economy and the Jubilee. As Illustrated in Semitic and Indo-European Village Communities. *Henry Schaeffer, Ph. D., S. T. M.*, Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill. $1.30.

The study of anthropology wields an abiding fascination over the modern scholar. Dr. Schaeffer's treatise adds a novel and interesting contribution to the ever-increasing literature on the study of man and his development into family, clan, tribe, and nation groups. The point which the author wishes to make is set forth in the preface, where he says: "The jubilee, as described in the Book of Leviticus, where archaic practises are frequently preserved, reflects tribal ideas of landownership in the subjection of the individual clansman to the rules and regulations of his respective group. That the group should assert its rights over the individual in the manner proposed by the law of the jubilee is quite in accordance with analogy, similar regulations and customs being met with elsewhere. Originally, the settled village community, in its ancient and modern manifestations, is really a tribal form of agrarian society, as may be seen from a comparative study of Semitic and Indo-European village communities. The land laws of Leviticus are strongly reminiscent, to say the least, of the old clan notions of landed property. Whatever may be said concerning the literary form of the twenty-fifth chapter of Leviticus, the fact remains that the regulations of the year of jubilee presuppose a tribal background." In discussing the subject, the writer furnishes interesting data. MUELLER.